

and support high living standards, this proposed import ceiling legislation would prevent the complete saturation of the American market with foreign imports.

I don't advocate any policy to shut off sales of foreign goods to America. All I say is that foreign imports in certain instances threaten our way of life. Therefore, I think we should have a policy of live and let live, and H.R. 17242 would accomplish this by sharing the growth of the American market with foreign nations.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to testify. I hope my testimony will be helpful.

(Attachments to Mr. Pelly's statement follow:)

Herewith, for Committee consideration is a letter and statistical data on relationships between imports and consumption of fish and fish products prepared for me by the Director of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries with specific reference to H.R. 17242.

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE,
BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL FISHERIES,
Washington, D.C., May 24, 1968.

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PELLY: In response to your letter of May 17, 1968, our staff has developed the requested statistical data on the relationship between imports and consumption of fish and fish products. Two important United States fish industry products have been considered under the proposed act, H.R. 17242. We believe the type of analysis made here is realistic under terms of the bill and in accordance we have prepared analyses of groundfish and fish meal. The computed statistical data for each is attached in Tables 1 and 2 respectively.

The groundfish analysis includes the species: cod, cusk, haddock, hake, pollock, and ocean perch. Imports are primarily in the form of frozen blocks and slabs which are processed principally into fish sticks and portions. Under terms of the proposed bill this product would fall into Section 5, (3) since imports had exceeded 40 percent of the domestic consumption by 1960 and since they had increased by 82 percent by 1967.

Section 5(2) of the bill applies to fish meal. Imports of fish meal had reached 31 percent of total apparent United States consumption by 1960 and they increased by 395 percent between 1960 and 1967. The two cited examples represent segments of the industry which have recently registered some concern for the effect of imports on their industries.

Sincerely yours,

H. E. CROWTHER, *Director.*

[Enclosures]

TABLE 1.—GROUND FISH SUPPLY, UTILIZATION, AND PERCENT IMPORTS ARE OF CONSUMPTION, UNITED STATES, 1960-67

Year	(In thousands of pounds)							Ratio imports/ consumption (percent)
	Domestic production	Imports	Beginning stocks	Total	Ending stocks	Exports	Apparent consumption	
1960.....	93,818	155,550	64,438	249,368	55,766	568	193,034	81
1961.....	93,039	195,099	55,766	343,904	49,388	600	293,916	66
1962.....	93,625	221,420	49,388	364,433	53,897	612	309,924	71
1963.....	83,419	231,768	53,897	369,084	56,860	543	311,681	74
1964.....	75,166	246,569	56,860	378,595	49,825	563	328,207	75
1965.....	77,180	294,954	49,825	421,959	64,029	764	357,166	82
1966.....	75,418	315,097	64,029	454,544	74,721	1,196	378,627	83
1967.....	71,032	283,570	74,721	429,323	64,671	1,242	363,410	78